DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 767 HE 034 423

AUTHOR	Borden, Victor M. H.
TITLE	Measuring Quality: Choosing among Surveys and Other Assessments of College Quality.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, DC.; Association for Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	47p.; Written with Jody L. Zak Owens.
AVAILABLE FROM	ACE Fulfillment Service, Department 191, Washington, DC 20055-0191 ($15). Tel: 301-604-9073; Fax: 301-604-0158. For full text: http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *College Administration; Decision Making; *Educational Assessment; Higher Education; National Competency Tests; *National Surveys; *Participation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this guide is to articulate a set of questions and issues that campus leaders can review when deciding whether to participate in a given survey or use a specific assessment instrument. The guide also describes some of the major national surveys and assessments. Although the guide does not rate or recommend these services, it suggests the criteria that campus leaders should use to determine the use and usefulness of any such instrument or service based on specific campus needs, capabilities, and goals. The guide is divided into three major sections. The first poses some general questions that are important to consider before deciding whether to participate, or continue to participate, in a national assessment. The second section provides common descriptive information for some of the national assessments that were popular when the guide was written. The third section reviews some specific questions and issues regarding the choice of a specific instrument or service and how to optimize participation. The report concludes with three tables that compare the major instruments and services reviewed in the guide. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 457 767

Measuring

Choosing Among Surveys and Other Assessments of College Quality

Victor M.H. Borden

with

Jody L. Zak Owens

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Bressler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

American Council on Education
Center for Policy Analysis

AIR Association for Institutional Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE034423

Measuring Quality:

Choosing Among Surveys and Other Assessments of College Quality

Victor M.H. Borden

with

Jody L. Zak Owens

Victor M. H. Borden is associate vice chancellor for information management and institutional research, and associate professor at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.

Jody L. Zak Owens is a research assistant and graduate student in higher education and student affairs at Indiana University.

American Council on Education
Center for Policy Analysis

Association for Institutional Research
for Management Research,
Policy Analysis, and Planning

Copyright © 2001

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036-1193

Association for Institutional Research
for Management Research,
Policy Analysis, and Planning

Association for Institutional Research
114 Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4462

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Single copies of this publication may be purchased from the American Council on Education for $15.00 each plus shipping and handling. Multiple copies are available for $10.00 each. Orders may be paid by VISA®, check, or money order (made payable to the American Council on Education) and sent to:

ACE Fulfillment Service
Department 191
Washington, DC 20055-0191
(301) 604-9073
Secure fax line: (301) 604-0158
PMDS Item Number: 309113

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

General Issues 3

National Assessments of Institutional Quality 5

Using Assessment Results Effectively 11

Conclusion 17

Table 1. Instrument, Administrator, Purpose, Use of Data, History, and Information Collected 18

Table 2. Target Institutions and Samples, Participation, Format, Administration Procedure, and Timeline 26

Table 3. Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information 34

Introduction

Dear College President:

As the public and political leaders have come to perceive higher education as both more important and more expensive than ever, demand has grown for accountability data and consumer information on the relative quality of individual colleges. The Survey of College and University Quality (SCUQ) was developed by leaders in the field of higher education assessment to help postsecondary institutions meet the demands of governing boards, accrediting agencies, and other stakeholders. Participating institutions have found this to be a rich source of data for marketing and recruitment as well. Perhaps most importantly, college and university faculty have embraced the results of the SCUQ as the most credible and useful evidence of student learning in college.

We invite you to join the hundreds of leading colleges and universities that participate in this survey . . .

Does this fictional solicitation sound familiar? In recent years, a proliferation of national assessments of institutional quality has emerged in response to increasing demands for accountability and consumer information. Many of these assessments rely on survey responses from current and former students. They operate on a cooperative system in which campuses pay to participate in the survey and, in return, receive one or more reports of the results and, sometimes, the raw data for further local analysis. Other assessments use data already collected from students when they take college entrance examinations. Standardized tests of college-level critical thinking and subject area achievement also are available, allowing faculty and

administrators to compare the performance of students progressing through their programs with that of students at other colleges and universities. College presidents and provosts often decide to participate in these efforts, but they may do so with little information on how best to evaluate these assessments and how to determine which assessment will provide the most useful information for their campus.

The purpose of this guide is to articulate a set of questions and issues that campus leaders can review when deciding whether to participate in a given survey or use a specific assessment instrument. The guide also describes some of the major national surveys and assessments. Although the guide does not rate or recommend these services, it suggests the criteria that campus leaders should employ to determine the use and usefulness of any such instrument or service, based on specific campus needs, capabilities, and goals.

This guide is divided into three major sections. The first section poses some general questions that are important to consider before deciding whether to participate (or continue to participate) in a national assessment. The second section provides common descriptive information for some of the national assessments that were popular when the guide was written. The third section reviews more specific questions and issues regarding the choice of a specific instrument or service and how to optimize participation.

The report concludes with three tables that compare the major instruments and services reviewed in the guide. New products and services likely will become available and existing ones transformed or even discontinued after publication of this guide. The Association for Institutional Research will maintain an updated version of the tables on its web site at http://www.airweb.org.

The next section of this guide poses some general questions to consider before engaging in any of these assessment efforts.

General Issues

Do these assessments live up to their promises?

As with all assessment efforts, the value of a national assessment survey or service depends on whether faculty, administrators, and staff members can use the results to support their ongoing processes and activities. Even if they see the questions and results as interesting and informative, they may not find the information useful. This guide's descriptive information regarding specific instruments and services may help an institution determine whether a particular instrument is relevant to its needs. However, the guide cannot answer questions regarding an institution's capability for most effectively using any particular type of assessment information.

The assessments described in this guide can be considered information tools for both accountability and improvement. Their usefulness depends on three general criteria:

- The appropriateness of the tool for the specific job at hand.
- The skills and experiences of users.
- The availability of sufficient financial, personal, and material resources.

How do we determine which survey is best suited to our purposes?

If you can ask this question effectively, you are halfway to choosing an appropriate instrument. The key to determining which instruments and assessments will work best for your institution is articulating a shared purpose among those most likely to use the results. For example, finding out about entering students' expectations and attitudes can help only if that information can be used by academic and student support service managers to develop, refine, and evaluate support programs; by

marketers and recruiters to improve strategies for attracting students; or by external affairs staff to develop print and electronic publications.

Who at my institution needs to be involved?

In addition to involving the faculty, staff, and administrators most likely to use the results, you should consider involving faculty and staff with expertise in institutional research, higher education assessment, public opinion polling, or related areas. If you have an institutional research or assessment office, it is especially important that you confer with those staff prior to committing to a national assessment. The proliferation of surveys and assessment instruments at all levels–in the classroom, by departments and programs, by campus offices, and so forth–has resulted in exceptionally high demand for student time and attention. This demand is beginning to compromise students' responsiveness as well as the quality of those responses. Staff in a centralized institutional research or assessment office often can best manage the overall load of assessment activity and help determine the technical merits of a specific instrument or service.

What is generally involved in participating?

Participation requirements vary among the national assessments considered in this guide, but there is always some significant institutional commitment beyond the cost of participation. For survey instruments, campus staff must generate at least a sample of students to be queried or tested. In many cases, campus staff administer the instrument, either in a group setting (for example, at freshman orientation) or through classroom, electronic, or mail distribution. Typically, the supplier processes completed instruments and prepares a report for the institution. The supplier also may provide customized reports for an additional cost. Often the most useful information comes from the subsequent analyses that campus faculty and staff perform for specific decision applications. The direct cost of participation is less than half of the total resource commitment required. However, the cost of participating in one of these assessments is likely to be small compared to the cost of improvements in programs, services, or accountability that may be facilitated by assessment results. As you consider participation, it is advisable to think about the resources that you are willing to commit to follow-up activities based on the results of the assessment.

The next section introduces some of the most popular national assessment surveys and services currently available for institutional use. It also provides an overview of the detailed information presented in the tables.

National Assessments of Institutional Quality

The three tables at the end of this guide summarize the characteristics of 27 national assessment instruments and services. The first 21 instruments and services assess the attitudes, experiences, and learning goals and gains of entering students (6), various groups of enrolled undergraduates (8), student proficiencies and learning outcomes (5), and alumni (2). Two services offer a series of instruments for students at varying points in their academic careers. The final four instruments and services assess institutional and program effectiveness through the views of various constituents, including faculty, administrators, students, and board members.

Profiles of entering students

UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) has been conducting the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey for more than 30 years. The resulting annual national report receives considerable press attention as the primary indicator of trends in new college student attitudes, expectations, and experiences. By some measures, this is the most widely used freshman survey, with more than 1,700 institutional participants since 1966. Any type of college or university can use the CIRP Freshman Survey, but HERI also offers the Entering Student Survey (ESS), tailored to the needs of two-year public and private colleges.

Many college and university presidents do not realize that most students complete one of two entering student surveys before they begin college. When students take the SAT or ACT college entrance exams, they complete an extensive information form that includes questions about their expectations, attitudes, and past academic behaviors. Moreover, the results of these surveys are available to colleges and

universities at little or no cost. Schools that use ACT COMPASS placement test services also can inexpensively incorporate the student profile questionnaire into their data collection processes.

Unlike the CIRP survey, the ACT and SAT profile questionnaires are administered at varying points in time, according to when students take their entrance exams (which can range from sophomore to senior year in high school). The data from these profiles can be useful, but they do not replace a true survey of entering students that is administered immediately prior to, or at the beginning of, a student's college career.

The College Board offers two versions of an entering student survey–the Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) and the ASQ Plus–that focus on students' experiences with the college admissions process. The ASQ provides feedback on the marketing and recruitment functions and processes for college admissions and so most directly serves enrollment management operations.

It is often useful to track changes in students' attitudes, expectations, and experiences as they progress through college. HERI's College Student Survey, described in the next section, provides this possibility as a follow-up to the CIRP freshman survey. The last survey considered in this section, the College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ), allows for the same type of tracking. The CSXQ is a prequel to the longer-standing College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) reviewed in the next section. The CSXQ gathers baseline information from students regarding their expectations for their forthcoming educational experiences, as assessed subsequently in the CSEQ.

Experiences of enrolled undergraduates

HERI's College Student Survey (CSS) and the CSEQ (administered by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning [CPRP]) are two relatively long-standing assessments of the undergraduate student's college experiences. As a follow-up to the freshman survey, the CSS focuses on students' level of satisfaction with various aspects of their college experiences. Although the CSEQ also includes a satisfaction index, this survey focuses more on students' views of their learning experiences. The CSEQ is guided by the principle that students learn best when actively engaged in college activities and experiences.

Both the CSS and CSEQ focus on the four-year baccalaureate experience. However, a Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) also is available through the University of Memphis Center for the Study of Higher Education. The CCSEQ follows CSEQ principles but targets the nontraditional, commuter students who typically attend community colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and American College Testing (ACT) have teamed up to produce Faces of the Future, a survey that captures the background characteristics and academic interests of community college students taking either credit-bearing or non-credit classes.

Recently, faculty at Indiana University's CPRP and UCLA's HERI have contributed to the development of new undergraduate student assessments that are closely tied to national efforts at transforming undergraduate education. The IU Center now administers the National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE), which was developed by a panel of leading assessment scholars as a model for quality in undergraduate education. The NSSE uses principles similar to those that guided the development of the CSEQ; however, the CSEQ is a longer instrument that covers specific outcomes and experiences in more detail. The NSSE, although relatively new, has a larger base of institutional participants than the CSEQ.

HERI's newest assessment instrument was developed in collaboration with the Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College. Your First College Year (YFCY) is both a follow-up to the CIRP freshman survey and an assessment of students' experiences with first-year programs such as learning communities, residential interest groups, and introductory courses. Similar to the NSSE, the YFCY focuses on specific types of programs and student behaviors that have emerged from higher education literature as best practices in undergraduate learning.

During the past 10 years, many institutions have adopted the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) as part of a strategic enrollment management initiative. The Noel-Levitz instrument uses a gap analysis technique to array students' satisfaction against their perceived importance of various aspects of the college experience. Noel-Levitz also has recently released a version of the SSI tailored to the needs of adult learners, called the Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS).

Student proficiencies and learning outcomes

The enrolled student surveys reviewed to this point focus on attitudinal and behavioral aspects of the student experience. Faculty at a number of colleges and universities now use one of several assessment instruments focusing on student learning outcomes in specific content areas and general education. ACT's Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) consists of a set of modules that assess student proficiency in writing, reading, math, science reasoning, and critical thinking. Users may customize these modules based on institutional needs. The Academic Profile developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) provides a similar assessment of general education skills and proficiencies. ETS also offers a specific assessment for critical thinking as well as a set of major field tests in 14 academic subject areas, such as biology, economics, music, and psychology. The Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing (PACAT), housed at Austin Peay State University, offers flexible content in eight subject-specific Area Concentration Achievement Tests (ACAT), which it can customize for individual institutions. PACAT also offers three additional subject area tests that do not yet have the flexible content option.

Institutions typically use the general education and subject area instruments from ACT, ETS, and PACAT for internal assessment and improvement purposes. However, many institutions tap into the rich source of learning outcomes information from these instruments to demonstrate their effectiveness to accrediting agencies. College adminis-

trators, faculty, and staff should familiarize themselves with the different options for assessing institutional effectiveness and the college student experience. Using too many assessment instruments, especially in uncoordinated ways, can undermine efforts to assess institutional quality by compromising the quality of student participation in these efforts.

Alumni status and achievement

Graduates can provide valuable information about how their experiences in college served them in pursuing their postgraduate goals and objectives. The Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (CAAS), produced by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), is available for this purpose. Alumni surveys also are offered as a part of several comprehensive survey programs, which are described in the next section.

More recently, Peterson's, the publisher of college guidebooks and a provider of web-based college search services, has incorporated into its services the College Results Survey (previously known as the Collegiate Results Instrument). This instrument uses real-life scenarios to assess alumni perceptions of their preparedness for their jobs, community participation, and civic responsibilities. Several institutions participated in a pilot of this instrument. Anyone who accesses Peterson's web site now can complete this survey. Visitors self-select their alma mater and then complete a four-section survey. Peterson's has not analyzed or reported yet on these unverified responses, and will determine how best to deploy this assessment in consultation with institutions.

Tracking changes in student attitudes and behaviors

Many of the organizations already mentioned offer multiple instruments for different populations, such as entering and continuing student surveys. However, several assessment programs provide a series of instruments that use common questions to help assess changes in student attitudes and behaviors over time. These survey programs are often appealing to colleges and universities that seek to implement a comprehensive range of survey assessments.

The Student Outcomes Information System (SOIS), offered by NCHEMS, includes surveys of entering, continuing, and noncontinuing students, and recent and previous graduates. ACT offers a set of 15 standardized instruments for colleges and universities, under the name Evaluation and Survey Services (ESS), which includes surveys for entering, continuing, noncontinuing, and graduated students. The ACT program includes specific instruments for assessing functions such as academic advising and for assessing the needs of both traditional and adult learners.

Faculty and other constituent views of institutional programs

The last section of each table lists several instruments that assess institutional quality by soliciting the views of faculty and other constituents about the campus climate for living, working, and learning. HERI's Faculty Survey explores the attitudes and opinions of college and university faculty about their work environment. The Noel-Levitz Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS) enables an institution to explore

similarities and differences among the priorities of various constituents, including students, faculty, and staff. NCHEMS offers an instrument, in both two- and four-year institution versions, that asks faculty, students, and staff to answer similar sets of questions about institutional performance and effectiveness. Finally, ETS offers the Program Self-Assessment Service, in both undergraduate and graduate versions, which assists academic programs engaging in a self-guided review.

The set of instruments and services reviewed in this section is by no means an exhaustive representation of all the assessments currently available. They offer a sampling of the various tools that college and university faculty and administrators can use in their assessment and accountability efforts. Too often, institutions see the results of one of these assessments as the endpoint of the process. The next section considers the questions and issues that determine whether such assessment efforts provide useful information for planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes that promote accountability and improvement.

Using Assessment Results Effectively

How well do assessments reflect student experiences on our campus?

Before acting upon the results of any assessment, it is important to understand how well the results reflect actual student experiences. Answering this question requires institutions to examine several technical issues, including the representativeness of the sample (what is the response rate and response bias?), the reliability of the instrument (would it yield the same results if administered to a different but equally representative group?), and the validity of the instrument (does it actually measure what it purports to measure?). For several reasons, an assessment instrument created by a nationally recognized organization likely will be more reliable and valid than one developed locally. However, measurement in higher education and in the social sciences is by no means exact.

The assessment instruments that this guide describes have a respectable level of reliability, but reliability is the easiest measurement characteristic to achieve. Sampling representativeness is entirely related to how the instrument is administered, which in many cases the institution partly or entirely determines. Validity is the thorniest issue. It encompasses questions related to the simplicity or complexity of what is being measured (for example, where students live while attending college versus their engagement in the academic community), as well as how well students' recollections reflect their actual experiences.

Validity also relates to how institutions interpret assessment results. It is unclear whether students' responses to questions about college experiences reveal more about student or institutional differences. For example, business majors' responses to questions about required general education courses may differ from those of

liberal arts majors taking the same courses at the same institution. Therefore, the institutional differences reflected through these assessments may well reflect differences in student profiles rather than differences in the quality of institutional programs and services.

For this reason, it is important to consider how comparative institutional benchmarks are generated; the assessment instruments and services described in this guide vary greatly in this regard. Some offer only global national comparisons. Others allow survey administrators to select comparison groups according to general institutional characteristics, such as selectiveness or Carnegie classification type. Still others allow for more flexible choices, including designating a comparison group among a minimum set of institutions (e.g., at least eight) from among all participants.

Despite all the limitations presented by issues of reliability, sample representativeness, and validity, the results of these assessments still can be quite useful for internal improvements and external accountability. But campus administrators need to understand these limitations to make informed decisions. The next two sections offer some ways to maximize these uses.

How can we use the data for assessment and improvement?

Several voices need to come together to ensure that institutions can put the results of these assessments to good use. As mentioned previously, those who are in a position to impact the quality of relevant institutional programs and processes must be at the table when choosing assessment instruments. The results of the assessments must be shared with these same individuals. Given the technical issues raised in the previous section, it is equally important to involve individuals who understand the technical and contextual limitations of such assessments, such as institutional researchers or faculty with expertise in assessment or survey research.

The respondents also can help institutions use assessment results effectively. Discussions with relevant student, alumni, and faculty groups often can provide keen insights into how questions were interpreted and, therefore, what the results may mean. Respondents' interpretations of results provide an additional perspective that helps the information user further understand the context and limitations of the results.

It is important to consider carefully where and at what level assessment results will be used before engaging in the effort. Given the size and variability of many college student bodies, data often must be disaggregated into meaningful subgroups based on characteristics such as class level or major before they can be valuable for program improvement. Survey administrators must draw samples in a way that allows generalization to the subgroups for which results are desired. Unfortunately, comparative institutional data are not always available for subgroups that may be meaningful to a particular campus.

Most of the national assessments introduced in this guide make provisions for including local items in the survey administration, thereby customizing the instrument for a particular campus or group of institutions. However, campus officials must consider some important limitations. The number of local items is

often limited. Furthermore, adding to the length of any assessment instrument detracts from the response rate and response quality. Response formats for local items usually are limited to five-point Likert-type scales (for example, strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). The institution may be able to vary the response scale, but doing so often detracts from the reliability of the instrument.

How can campuses, governing boards, policy makers, or other constituents use the results for public accountability?

With all the inherent limitations of any particular assessment, college and university presidents must concern themselves with who receives the results of these assessments and how their institution packages and disseminates these results to external audiences. The data from most of the instruments described in this guide are considered the property of the institution. As such, the administrators, faculty, and staff of the institution control the way the information is packaged and presented.

Several of the instruments discussed in this guide were designed with public accountability as a primary purpose. One explicit goal of the NSSE is to impact national rankings of colleges and universities. Peterson's College Results Survey, which students and alumni can complete outside the control of their institution, may become a centerpiece of Peterson's consumer information services. An increasing number of state and university systems are using common assessment surveys to benchmark institutional effectiveness.

Because of this trend, the use and control of results from some of these national assessments for public accountability may become more complicated in the future. In the short run, these instruments provide a valuable source of campus-level accountability information for governing boards, public constituencies, and accreditation agencies. In the long run, the use of these and other types of assessments for internal planning and improvement may be the best support for external accountability. Colleges and universities that aggressively evaluate their programs and services–and act on that information to improve those programs and services–will gather a rich body of evidence to support their claims of institutional effectiveness.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of using national surveys, compared to local instruments?

National surveys are a relatively cost-effective way to gather assessment information. The organizations that develop these instruments often devote greater technical and financial resources than can an individual institution. They also test these instruments on a broader population than can a single institution. The availability of comparative data from other institutional participants is an important advantage to using a national assessment, but, as mentioned earlier, comparative benchmarks may be of limited use if the comparison group does not include institutions with student profiles similar to the target institution or if student profile differences otherwise are not taken into account. Moreover, comparative data often are not available at disaggregate levels, where results can be most potent.

Local assessment instruments provide much greater control and attention to

local issues, and survey administrators can more closely integrate such instruments across populations and samples. A local assessment of decent quality typically costs more to administer than a national assessment but often yields results that are more directly applicable to the sponsoring campus. The lack of comparative data is a major limitation, but institutions working in data-sharing consortia can circumvent this limitation by introducing common items and methods among local instruments.

Developing quality local assessments requires a significant commitment of time and resources that some colleges and universities cannot afford; however, effective use of national assessments requires a similar significant commitment. The reports produced by the service providers are informative and have some direct use, but far more use comes from local follow-up analyses that address issues of immediate concern to individuals and groups working on improvement efforts.

Do we need to use the human subjects review process when administering one of these assessments?

The use of human subjects in assessment research is coming under increased scrutiny from two sources. In recent years, federal agencies that monitor the use of human subjects in research have tightened the enforcement of their regulations. The privacy of student and faculty records also is garnering increased attention among both state and federal agencies, as guided by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Technically, all research on human subjects requires review by a sanctioned human subjects review board. Institutional and program evaluation efforts are, in themselves, not considered research. Many college and university review boards define research according to the use of the results. Once faculty and staff prepare information for dissemination to an audience external to the institution, it becomes research; however, this does not always require that the initial data collection effort be reviewed. Faculty and staff who prepare articles or presentations to professional organizations that use data from institutional assessments should consult with their local review boards about the proper procedures to follow.

Regardless of whether assessment results are disseminated beyond the institution, survey administrators should treat data collected through national or local assessment instruments as confidential student records. Many colleges and universities develop specific policies regarding the use and storage of student and faculty data. In some cases, institutional policies need to be revisited when considering assessment data, since these data usually are not stored in the same information systems environment as operational student and faculty data.

How do these national assessments compare with other ways to assess institutional quality?

Assessments of institutional quality can take a variety of forms, including classroom-based activities, student performance assessments, program reviews, focus groups, exiting senior interviews, and so forth. The national surveys, standardized tests, and other assessment services considered in this guide can be an important part of these assessments. Colleges and universities that have

well-developed assessment programs typically use a variety of assessments, including but not limited to national instruments. No single method offers the best approach. Each has benefits and limitations, which is why a comprehensive assessment program usually includes multiple, convergent methods.

For institutions that do not have well-established assessment programs, the national surveys described in this guide can be catalysts for further development. Specific findings can lead to action. Institutions can use perceived limitations as points of departure to identify the focus of future assessments.

Do these assessments encompass the views of all major student and other constituent groups?

Most of the instruments reviewed in this guide draw information about the college student experience directly from students: new, continuing, and graduated. A few instruments gather input on institutional quality from faculty, administrators, and staff. One voice that is completely absent from these assessments is that of the individuals and organizations who interact with and hire college and university graduates: employers, graduate school administrators, social agencies, and so forth. Several specialized accrediting agencies require college program administrators to survey employers, but there is, as of yet, no popular national instrument.

Many of the popular surveys of the college student experience (for example, the CIRP Freshman Survey, CSEQ, and NSSE) originate from research on traditional-aged students attending residential universities. Some instruments are tailored for two-year colleges, such as the CCSEQ and Faces of the Future. Among the 15 instruments included in ACT's Evaluation and Survey Services program is an assessment designed to evaluate the experiences of adult learners (for example, nontraditional-aged and commuter students). Noel-Levitz's new Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS) also is tailored toward this group. However, the research base still is somewhat skewed toward the definitions of quality that emerge from the traditional college experience.

Conclusion

The American system of higher education is characterized by institutional diversity, and the increasing variety of national assessments is only beginning to reflect this diversity. As colleges and universities respond to the increasing demand for public accountability and consumer information, we hope to see an attendant increase in the number of assessment instruments that better reflect the complete range of college and university missions and clientele. College and university presidents can contribute to this end by initiating discussions on their campuses and among similar types of institutions about the kinds of evidence that would best reflect the quality of their institutions. The most exemplary local and consortia efforts to assess quality in terms of institutional mission likely will exert the strongest influence on the future developments of national assessments.

TABLE 1. Instrument, Administrator, Purpose, Use of Data, History, and Information Collected

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	PURPOSE	USE OF DATA
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES		
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey/Entering Student Survey (ESS) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA and American Council on Education (ACE)	Collects demographic and attitudinal information on incoming students. Serves as baseline for longitudinal follow-up. Measures trends in higher education and characteristics of American college freshmen.	Admissions and recruitment; academic program development and review; self-study and accreditation; public relations and development; institutional research and assessment; retention studies; longitudinal research about the impacts of policies and programs.
Freshman Class Profile Service American College Testing (ACT)	Summarizes the characteristics of ACT-tested enrolled and nonenrolled students by institution.	Institutional marketing and recruitment: knowledge of competitors, characteristics of enrolled students, feeder high schools, etc.
Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ) The College Board	Provides a basic profile of students who took the SAT.	Admissions and recruitment; institutional research and assessment; retention studies.
Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) and Admitted Student Questionnaire Plus (ASQ Plus) The College Board	Studies students' perceptions of their institution and its admissions process. Facilitates competitor and overlap comparisons.	Recruitment; understanding of market position; evaluation of institutional image; calculation of overlap win/loss; evaluation of financial aid packaging.
College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning (CPRP) at Indiana University	Assesses new students' expectations upon matriculation. Findings can be compared with student reports of their actual experiences as measured by the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ).	Comparison with CSEQ data to identify areas where the first-year experience can be improved. Also can be used for campus research and assessment initiatives.
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
College Student Survey (CSS) HERI	Evaluates students' experiences and satisfaction to assess how students have changed since entering college. Can be used longitudinally with the CIRP Freshman Survey.	Student assessment activities; accreditation and self-study; campus planning; policy analysis; retention analysis; and study of other campus issues.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HISTORY	INFORMATION COLLECTED
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES	
Established in 1966 at ACE, the CIRP was transferred to HERI at UCLA in 1973.	Demographic characteristics; expectations of the college experience; secondary school experiences; degree goals and career plans; college finances; attitudes, values, and life goals; reasons for attending college.
Student Profile Section (SPS) is a set of 189 items included in the ACT Assessment Program. Certain items are updated every few years for currency (e.g., racial/ethnic categories). The current format of the SPS was developed in 1973.	Demographics: background information; high school characteristics and evaluation; needs assessment; career interests; college plans; and achievement test scores.
Not available.	Prior academic record; high school course-taking patterns; student demographics; and family background.
ASQ was developed in 1987, ASQ Plus in 1991.	Student assessment of programs, admissions procedures, literature, institutional image; financial aid packages; common acceptances; comparative evaluations. ASQ Plus provides specific institutional comparisons.
Originally developed in 1997 for a FIPSE-funded project, CSXQ is an abbreviated version of CSEQ. Second edition available since 1998.	Background information; expectations for involvement in college activities; predicted satisfaction with college; and expected nature of college learning environments.
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES	
The CSS was initiated in 1993 to permit individual campuses to survey undergraduates at any level and to conduct follow-up studies of their CIRP Freshman Survey respondents.	Satisfaction with college experience; student involvement; cognitive and affective development; student values, attitudes, and goals; degree aspirations and career plans; Internet, e-mail, and other computer uses.

TABLE 1 (continued). Instrument, Administrator, Purpose, Use of Data, History, and Information Collected

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	PURPOSE	USE OF DATA
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Faces of the Future American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and ACT	Assesses the current state of the community college population and explores the role community colleges play in students' lives.	Community college students; benchmarking; comparisons to national data; tracking of trends in student population.
College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) CPRP	Measures quality of students' experiences inside and outside the classroom, perceptions of environment, satisfaction, and progress toward 25 desired learning and personal development outcomes.	Outcomes of college; accreditation review; institutional research, evaluation, and assessment; student recruitment and retention; assessment of undergraduate education.
Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) University of Memphis, Center for the Study of Higher Education	Measures students' progress and experiences.	Self-study and accreditation review; assessment of institutional effectiveness; evaluation of general education, transfer, and vocational programs; use of technology; measurement of student interest, impressions, and satisfaction.
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) CPRP	Gathers outcomes assessment, undergraduate quality, and accountability data. Measures students' engagement in effective educational practices (level of challenge, active learning, student-faculty interaction, supportive environment, etc.).	Institutional improvement and benchmarking; monitoring of progress over time; self-studies and accreditation; and other private and public accountability efforts.
Your First College Year (YFCY) HERI and Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College	Designed as a follow-up survey to the CIRP Freshman Survey. Assesses student development during the first year of college.	Admissions and recruitment; academic program development and review; self-study and accreditation; public relations and development; institutional research and assessment; retention studies; longitudinal research; first-year curriculum efforts.
Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) Noel-Levitz	Measures students' satisfaction.	Student retention; student recruitment; strategic planning and institutional effectiveness.
Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS) Noel-Levitz	Measures satisfaction of students age 25 and older.	Student retention; student recruitment; strategic planning and institutional effectiveness.

HISTORY	INFORMATION COLLECTED
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES	
Developed in 1998 and piloted in early 1999, the survey is now in its third year of administration.	Background information (general, employment, education); current college experiences (access and purpose, learning and satisfaction, expected outcome and intent, transitions).
Developed by C. Robert Pace in the 1970s, CSEQ is in its fourth edition (second edition, 1983; third edition, 1990). Since 1994 George Kuh (Indiana University) has directed the research program.	Background information; level of student engagement in learning activities; student ratings of college learning environment; estimate of student gains toward learning goals; index of student satisfaction with the college.
Co-authored by Jack Friedlander, C. Robert Pace, Patricia H. Murrell, and Penny Lehman (1991, revised 1999).	Amount, breadth, and quality of effort expended in both in-class and out-of-class experiences; progress toward educational outcomes; satisfaction with community college environment; demographic and background characteristics.
Designed in 1998 by a group of assessment experts chaired by Peter Ewell, NCHEMS. Project director is George Kuh, Indiana University.	Student reports of quality of effort inside and outside the classroom, including time devoted to various activities and amount of reading and writing, higher order thinking skills, quality of interactions, educational and personal gains, and satisfaction.
Administered by HERI in partnership with the Policy Center on the First Year of College, and funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, YFCY was pilot-tested in spring 2000. Second pilot is scheduled for spring 2001. Full administration will begin in 2002.	One-third of items are CIRP post-test items. Remaining questions address students' academic, residential, and employment experiences; self-concept and life goals; patterns of peer and faculty interaction; adjustment and persistence; degree aspirations; and satisfaction.
SSI was piloted in 1993 and became available to institutions in 1994.	Ratings on importance of and satisfaction with various aspects of campus. The survey covers most aspects of student experience.
ASPS was piloted and became available to institutions in 2000.	Ratings on importance of and satisfaction with various aspects of campus. The survey is specific to the experience of adult students.

TABLE 1 (continued). Instrument, Administrator, Purpose, Use of Data, History, and Information Collected

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	PURPOSE	USE OF DATA
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) ACT	Assesses college students' academic achievement in general education skills.	Document levels of proficiency; compare local populations via user norms; establish eligibility requirements; report educational outcomes for accountability and accreditation; improve teaching; and enhance student learning.
Academic Profile Educational Testing Service (ETS) and The College Board	Assesses college-level general education skills.	Describe performance of individuals and groups; measure growth in learning; use data as a guidance tool and performance standard.
Tasks in Critical Thinking ETS	Assesses proficiency in college-level, higher order thinking skills.	Each student receives a confidential report on skills performance. Data can help institution learn more about teaching and program effectiveness.
Major Field Tests ETS	Assesses students' academic achievement in major field of study.	Measure student academic achievement and growth and assess effectiveness of departmental curricula for planning and development.
Area Concentration Achievement Tests (ACAT) Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing (PACAT) at Austin Peay State University	Assesses outcomes and provides curriculum-specific feedback on student achievement.	Provide specific program analysis.
ALUMNI		
Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (CAAS) National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)	Measures evidence of institutional effectiveness and reports on alumni personal development and career preparation.	Help clarify institutional mission and goals and assist in developing new goals. Evaluate mission attainment and impact of general education programs, core requirements, and academic support services.
College Results Survey (CRS) Peterson's, a Thomson Learning Company	Identifies personal values, abilities, occupations, work skills, and participation in lifelong learning of college graduates. Uses alumni responses to establish a unique institutional profile.	Peterson's uses data collected online for consumer information at www.bestcollegepicks.com. Institutions use data collected in collaboration with Peterson's for self-study.

HISTORY	INFORMATION COLLECTED
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES	
CAAP was introduced in 1988.	Assessment of proficiency in core general education skills, including writing (objective and essay), reading, math, science reasoning, and critical thinking.
Introduced in 1992 to assist institutions with accreditation, accountability, and program improvement.	Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores measure college-level reading, college-level writing, critical thinking, and mathematics.
Introduced in 1992 to address the need to assess college-level higher order thinking skills and to improve teaching and learning.	Measures college-level inquiry, analysis, and communication skills.
These tests originally were based on the GRE subject tests and are jointly sponsored by ETS and the GRE Board. Each test is periodically updated to maintain currency with standard undergraduate curricula.	Factual knowledge; ability to analyze and solve problems; ability to understand relationships; and ability to interpret material. Available for 15 disciplines; see www.ets.org/hea for listing.
Established in 1983 and expanded in 1988 by a FIPSE grant, ACAT is a nationally normed instrument with items written by faculty in the various disciplines.	Discipline-specific surveys cover agriculture, biology, criminal justice, geology, history, neuroscience, political science, psychology, art, English literature, and social work.
ALUMNI	
Not available.	Employment and continuing education; undergraduate experience; development of intellect; achievement of community goals; personal development and enrichment; community participation; demographic and background information.
Formerly the Collegiate Results Instrument, CRS was developed by Robert Zemsky at the University of Pennsylvania with support from the U.S. Department of Education and the Knight Higher Education Collaborative.	Lifelong learning; personal values; confidence; occupation and income; and work skills.

TABLE 1 (continued). Instrument, Administrator, Purpose, Use of Data, History, and Information Collected

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	PURPOSE	USE OF DATA
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS		
Student Outcomes Information Survey (SOIS) NCHEMS	Collects information about students' needs and reactions to their educational experiences.	Longitudinal assessment of students' experiences and opinions.
Evaluation/Survey Services ACT	Assesses needs, development, attitudes, and opinions of students and alumni.	Accreditation; program and service assessment; outcomes assessment; retention; alumni follow-up; institutional self-study.
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS		
Faculty Survey HERI	Collects information about the workload, teaching practices, job satisfaction, and professional activities of collegiate faculty and administrators.	Accreditation and self-study reports; campus planning and policy analysis; faculty development programs; benchmarking faculty characteristics.
Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) NCHEMS	Assesses institutional performance and effectiveness.	Self-study; marketing.
Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS) Noel-Levitz	Assesses faculty, staff, and administrative perceptions and priorities (recommended with the SSI to determine where priorities overlap with those of students).	Student retention; student recruitment; strategic planning and institutional effectiveness. Institutions can pinpoint areas of consensus on campus.
Program Self-Assessment Service (PSAS) and Graduate Program Self-Assessment Service (GPSAS) ETS	Assesses students' opinions on undergraduate and graduate programs.	Used by departments for self-study and as additional indicators of program quality for accreditation purposes.

HISTORY	INFORMATION COLLECTED
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS	
In use since 1978.	Background, personal goals, and career aspirations; factors influencing college choice; satisfaction with college experience; activities while in college; educational plans and accomplishments; career choices; career successes.
Established in 1979.	Fifteen standardized instruments include alumni surveys, outcomes assessment surveys, satisfaction surveys, opinion surveys, entering student surveys, and nonreturning student surveys. See www.act.org/ess/index.html for complete list of available surveys.
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS	
In seven faculty surveys conducted since 1969, HERI has collected data on more than 500,000 college faculty at more than 1,000 institutions. The next faculty survey is scheduled for 2001-02.	Background characteristics; teaching practices and research activities; interactions with students and colleagues; professional activities; faculty attitudes and values; perceptions of the institutional climate; job satisfaction.
IPS is a by-product of a national research study to assess how various institutional conditions are related to the external environment, strategic competence, and effectiveness.	More than 100 items measure eight dimensions of institutional performance.
IPS was developed as a parallel instrument to the Noel-Levitz SSI. IPS was piloted and made available in 1997.	Perceptions on the importance of meeting various student expectations, and their level of agreement that institution actually is meeting these expectations.
GPSAS was developed in conjunction with the Council of Graduate Schools in the 1970s. PSAS was developed in the 1980s using GPSAS as a model.	Quality of teaching; scholarly excellence; faculty concern for students; curriculum; students' satisfaction with programs; resource accessibility; employment assistance; faculty involvement; departmental procedures; learning environment.

TABLE 2. Target Institutions and Samples, Participation, Format, Administration Procedure, and Timeline

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	TARGET INSTITUTIONS/SAMPLES	PARTICIPATION RATES
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES		
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey/Entering Student Survey (ESS) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA and American Council on Education (ACE)	All types/Incoming students (ESS specifically designed for two-year institutions).	Since 1966, 1,700 institutions and 10 million students have participated. In fall 2000, 717 institutions and 404,000 students participated.
Freshman Class Profile Service American College Testing (ACT)	All types/All ACT test-takers.	Over 1 million high school students are tested each year. This service includes more than 550,000 enrolled students from 900 institutions each year.
Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ) The College Board	All types/All SAT test-takers.	All students who participate in the SAT complete the SDQ. Responses only sent if student indicates 'Yes' to being included in Student Search Service.
Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) and Admitted Student Questionnaire Plus (ASQ Plus) The College Board	All types/All admitted students.	Every year, 220 institutions participate and 400,000 students are surveyed.
College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning (CPRP) at Indiana University	Four-year public and private institutions/ Incoming students.	More than 33,000 students at two dozen different types of colleges and universities participate.
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
College Student Survey (CSS) HERI	All types/All students.	CSS has collected data from more than 230,000 students at 750 institutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FORMAT	ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE	TIMELINE
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES		
Four-page paper survey.	Colleges order surveys from HERI, administer surveys on campus, and return completed surveys for processing. Most campuses administer survey in proctored groups.	Register for survey in the spring. Surveys are administered in the summer and fall, usually during orientation. Report available in December.
Responses are collected via paper as part of the registration materials for the ACT Assessment. They are later electronically combined with assessment results for reporting and research purposes.	Students complete this when registering for the ACT. Responses and ACT scores are sent to schools and institutions.	Institutions register in July of each year. Enrollment information is sent to ACT from September through June; reports are produced within 30 to 60 days.
This paper-and-pencil instrument is completed as part of the test registration process.	Students complete questionnaire prior to taking the SAT. Responses and SAT scores are sent to schools.	Tapes and/or diskettes are sent to institutions six times per year as part of SAT Test reports.
Each program has matriculating and nonmatriculating student version of a standardized paper survey. Optional web version also is available.	Colleges administer and collect surveys, then send them to The College Board for processing. ASQ Plus asks colleges to identify their major competitors, and students rate their college choice vs. other top choices.	Institutions determine when to mail surveys, but The College Board recommends that they do so as soon as they know who will enroll (usually mid- to late May). Follow-up strongly recommended.
Four-page paper survey; web version under development. Takes 10 minutes to complete. Demo version at www.indiana.edu/~cseq.	Institutions administer surveys and return completed instruments to CPRP for processing. Web version is administered via a server at Indiana University; institutions provide student contact information.	Most institutions administer the survey during fall orientation. To compare student expectations with actual experiences, colleges administer the CSEQ to the same students the following spring.
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Four-page paper survey.	Campuses administer surveys and return them to data processing center. Campuses may choose to survey students who completed the CIRP for the purposes of longitudinal study.	Register January 1 or May 1. Two administration periods available: January through June and July through December. Reports from first period available in fall, from second period in February of subsequent year.

TABLE 2 (continued). Target Institutions and Samples, Participation, Format, Administration Procedure, and Timeline

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	TARGET INSTITUTIONS/SAMPLES	PARTICIPATION RATES
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) CPRP	Four-year public and private institutions/All students.	More than 500 colleges and universities and approximately 250,000 students since 1983 (when second edition was published) have participated.
Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) University of Memphis, Center for the Study of Higher Education	Community colleges/All students.	The 1991 edition collected data from 45,823 students at 57 institutions. The 1999 edition collected data from 18,483 students at 40 institutions.
Faces of the Future American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and ACT	Community colleges/All students (credit and noncredit).	In fall 1999, more than 100,000 students at 250 institutions participated in the survey.
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) CPRP	Four-year public and private institutions/First-year and senior students.	After 1999 field test, the first national administration was in spring 2000 with 195,000 students at 276 institutions. CPRP annually surveys approximately 200,000 students at 275 to 325 colleges and universities.
Your First College Year (YFCY) HERI and Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College	All types/Students near the end of the first year of college.	Total of 58 institutions and 19,000 first-year students will participate in spring 2001 pilot. Participation expected to be open to all institutions in spring 2002.
Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) Noel-Levitz	All types (four-year, two-year, and career school versions are available)/All students.	SSI is used by more than 1,200 colleges and universities. More than 800,000 student records are in the national database.
Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS) Noel-Levitz	All types/All students 25 years and older.	ASPS was piloted by more than 30 institutions and more than 4,000 students in spring 2000.

FORMAT	ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE	TIMELINE
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Eight-page paper survey; identical web survey also available. Takes 20 to 25 minutes to complete. Demo version at www.indiana.edu/~cseq.	Institutions administer surveys and return completed instruments to CPRP for processing. Web version is administered via a server at Indiana University; institutions provide student contact information.	Most institutions administer the survey at the mid-point or later in the spring term so that students have enough experience on campus to provide valid, reliable judgments. For research purposes, the CSEQ also can be administered at other times.
Paper survey, self-report (Likert scale).	Instruments can be mailed to students or distributed in classes, through student organizations, or other student assemblies. Completion of instrument takes 20 to 30 minutes.	The Center provides surveys upon receipt of an order. Scoring is completed and results are mailed two to three weeks after colleges return instruments to the Center.
Paper survey.	Colleges order materials from ACT and administer surveys on campus. Completed surveys are returned to ACT for scoring and processing.	Surveys can be administered during AACC/ACT fall administration (October) for a reduced cost, or can be administered at other times at regular cost.
Students can complete either a four-page paper survey or the identical online version. Students at one-fifth of participating schools complete the web survey. Demo version at www.indiana.edu/~nsse.	Schools send student data files, letterhead, and invitation letters to CPRP, which handles data collection, including random sampling, sending surveys to students, and conducting follow-ups. Students return surveys to CPRP.	Institutions send data files to CPRP in late fall. Surveys are mailed to students in late winter and early spring. Follow-ups continue through the spring. CPRP sends institutional reports and data to schools in late summer.
Four-page paper survey; web survey also available.	HERI oversees administration of paper or web-based survey instrument; students return completed survey forms to data processing center.	Institutions register for survey in the fall and administer survey in the spring. Reports are available in late summer.
Paper survey. In spring 2001, the survey also will be available on the web.	SSI is generally administered in a classroom setting and takes 25 to 30 minutes. Web version takes 15 to 20 minutes. The URL is e-mailed to students along with a specific student numeric password to enter the survey area.	Students can complete the survey anytime during the academic year. Surveys generally arrive on campus within one week of ordering. Institutions send completed surveys to Noel-Levitz for processing. Reports are ready for shipment in 12 to 15 business days.
Paper survey. In spring 2001, the survey will be available on the web.	ASPS is administered in a classroom setting and takes 25 to 30 minutes. Web completion takes students 15 to 20 minutes. For the web version, the URL and password are e-mailed to students.	Students can complete the survey anytime during the academic year. Surveys generally arrive on campus within one week of ordering. Institutions send completed surveys to Noel-Levitz for processing. Reports are ready for shipment in 12 to 15 business days.

TABLE 2 (continued): Target Institutions and Samples, Participation, Format, Administration Procedure, and Timeline

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	TARGET INSTITUTIONS/SAMPLES	PARTICIPATION RATES
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) ACT	All types/All students.	More than 600 institutions have used CAAP since 1988. More than 450,000 students have tested between 1998 and 2000.
Academic Profile Educational Testing Service (ETS) and The College Board	All types/All students.	This survey has been used by 375 institutions and 1 million students.
Tasks in Critical Thinking ETS	All types/All students.	This instrument is administered by 35 institutions to 200 to 500 students at each institution.
Major Field Tests ETS	Four-year colleges and universities/Senior students.	In the 1999–2000 academic year, more than 1,000 departments from 606 higher education institutions administered nearly 70,000 tests. Current national comparative data include accumulated scores from 96,802 seniors.
Area Concentration Achievement Tests (ACAT) Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing (PACAT) at Austin Peay State University	Two- and four-year public and private institutions/Generally seniors, although ACAT can serve as a pre-test.	Approximately 300 institutions and more than 50,000 students have participated.
ALUMNI		
Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (CAAS) NCHEMS	All types (two-year and four-year versions available)/Alumni.	Information not available.
College Results Survey (CRS) Peterson's, a Thomson Learning Company	Bachelor degree–granting institutions/Alumni, preferably four to 10 years following degree attainment. Recommended sample size is 2,000.	The pilot study included 80 institutions and 40,000 instruments. The web-based survey is open to any graduate. There is no limit on the number of participants.

FORMAT	ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE	TIMELINE
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Demographic questions collected on paper with assessment battery. Users may add up to nine additional items; they also may design their own assessment test battery by choosing from the six different skill modules.	Colleges order assessment battery from ACT, administer it during a locally determined two-week test period, and return it to ACT for processing.	Flexible administration schedule. Each assessment module can be administered within a 50-minute class period. Institutions must order assessments at least two weeks prior to administration period.
Paper survey (long and short forms). Long form contains 108 multiple-choice questions and takes 100 minutes. Short form contains 36 questions. Optional essay is available.	Colleges order materials from ETS and administer them to students. Colleges return tests to ETS for scoring.	Institutions administer tests on their own timeline. Tests are scored weekly, and reports are issued approximately three weeks after ETS receives tests.
Open-ended or performance-based 90-minute "tasks" in humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences. The score range for each skill is 1 to 6, with 4 as the core score.	Colleges order materials from ETS and administer them to students. ETS trains faculty to score students' responses, or ETS scores the tasks. There are nine separate tasks; three tasks can be used for assessing fewer than 100 students.	Colleges decide who and when to test. Faculty decides scoring schedule or ETS provides a three- to four-week turnaround for issuing a report.
Paper-and-pencil test.	Institutions order tests, administer them onsite to students, and return them to ETS for processing.	Must order three to four weeks prior to administration for standard shipping. Answer sheets received by the beginning of each month are scored that month (no scoring in January or September). Reports are mailed three weeks after scoring.
Paper survey. Multiple-choice test requiring 48 to 120 minutes, depending on content.	Institutions order surveys, administer them to students, and return them to PACAT for scoring and analysis.	Must order surveys at least 15 days prior to administration date. PACAT scores surveys during the last full working week of the month and mails reports the first working week of the month.
ALUMNI		
Paper survey.	Colleges order surveys from NCHEMS, administer surveys, and return to NCHEMS for scoring.	NCHEMS mails results three weeks from date surveys are returned for scoring.
Web-based survey comprised of four sections. Takes 15 to 20 minutes to complete.	Alumni visit web site to complete survey. Models for working with individual institutions are under development. Institutions identify alumni cohorts, who Peterson's then contacts and directs to the online instrument.	Unlimited online availability or as arranged.

TABLE 2 (continued). Target Institutions and Samples, Participation, Format, Administration Procedure, and Timeline

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	TARGET INSTITUTIONS/SAMPLES	PARTICIPATION RATES
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS		
Student Outcomes Information Survey (SOIS) NCHEMS	All types (two- and four-year versions available)/ Questionnaires for entering students, continuing students, former students, graduating students, recent alumni, and long-term alumni.	Information not available.
Evaluation/Survey Services ACT	All types/New students, enrolled students, non-returning students, and alumni.	Since 1979, 1,000 institutions have administered more than 6 million standardized surveys nationwide.
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS		
Faculty Survey HERI	All types/Full-time undergraduate faculty and academic administrators.	In 1998-99, data were collected from more than 55,000 faculty at 429 colleges and universities.
Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) NCHEMS	All types (two-year and four-year versions available)/Faculty, administrators, and board members.	Information not available.
Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS) Noel-Levitz	All types (two-year and four-year versions available)/Faculty, administrators, and staff.	More than 400 institutions have used the IPS.
Program Self-Assessment Service (PSAS) and Graduate Program Self-Assessment Service (GPSAS) ETS	College and university programs/ Students, faculty, and alumni (separate questionnaires for each group). GPSAS has separate questionnaires for master's and Ph.D. programs.	In 1999-2000, 65 institutions and 12,000 students, faculty members, and alumni participated.

FORMAT	ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE	TIMELINE
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS		
Paper survey.	Colleges order surveys from NCHEMS, administer surveys, and return them to NCHEMS for scoring.	NCHEMS mails results two weeks from date surveys are returned for scoring.
Most surveys are four-page paper documents; one is two pages in length.	Administration procedures are established at the discretion of the institution.	Institutions mail completed surveys to ACT for processing. Scanning occurs every second and fourth Friday; ACT produces and mails reports three to four weeks after scanning.
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS		
Four-page paper survey.	Faculty surveys are sent to campuses in the fall. Campuses are responsible for survey distribution. HERI provides outgoing envelopes and pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelopes that respondents mail directly to HERI's survey processing center.	Institutions register in the spring and summer. HERI administers surveys in the fall and winter. HERI issues campus profile reports the following spring and summer.
Paper survey.	Colleges order surveys and distribute them. Surveys include a postage-paid return envelope for respondents to return survey directly to NCHEMS to maintain anonymity.	NCHEMS returns results three weeks after institutionally determined cut-off date.
Paper survey. In spring 2001, the survey also will be available on the web.	The paper survey takes about 30 minutes and can be distributed via various methods on campus, including campus mail, face-to-face distribution, and staff meetings. The web version takes about 20 minutes. URL and password can be e-mailed to staff.	Institutions can administer the IPS anytime during the academic year. Surveys generally arrive on campus within a week of ordering. Institutions return completed surveys to Noel-Levitz for processing. Reports are ready for shipment within 12 to 15 business days.
Paper survey.	Institutions purchase and administer the questionnaires and send completed questionnaires back to ETS for reporting.	Processing begins the first working day of each month. ETS ships reports about three weeks after start of processing.

TABLE 3. Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	REPORT INFORMATION	NATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE?
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES		
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey/Entering Student Survey (ESS) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA and American Council on Education (ACE)	Paper report with local results, and aggregate results for similar institutions derived from the national norms. Separate profiles for transfer and part-time students. Special reports and data file available for a fee.	Yes–national results included in standard report.
Freshman Class Profile Service American College Testing (ACT)	Paper report containing an executive summary; college attractions; academic achievement, goals and aspirations; plans and special needs; high school information; competing institutions; and year-to-year trends. A range of free and for-fee reports available.	Yes–national user data and college student profiles available.
Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ) The College Board	Institutions receive SDQ responses for students who indicate "yes" to the Student Search Service on the registration form.	Yes–national and state-level benchmark reports available on paper and on The College Board web site.
Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) and Admitted Student Questionnaire Plus (ASQ Plus) The College Board	Highlight report (executive summary), detailed report with all data, competitor report for ASQ Plus only, norms report with national data. Data file also available.	Yes–included in standard report.
College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning (CPRP) at Indiana University	Computer diskette containing raw institutional data file and output file with descriptive statistics. Schools also receive a hard copy of the output file. Additional analyses available for a fee.	No–tentative norms are under development and will be available summer 2001. Norms reports will include relevant comparison group data by Carnegie type.

LOCAL ITEMS & CONSORTIA OPTIONS	COST	CONTACT INFORMATION/URL
ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES		
Contains up to 21 additional local questions. Consortia analyses available for a fee.	Participation fee of $400 plus $1 per returned survey for processing.	Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, 3005 Moore Hall–Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521. Phone: 310-825-1925. Fax: 310-206-2228. E-mail: heri@uclu.edu www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.htm
By providing additional data, campuses can use this service to summarize variables at all stages of the enrollment funnel: students who submitted their ACT scores, those who applied, those who were admitted, and those who enrolled.	There is no cost for the basic information.	Freshman Class Profile Service Coordinator Phone: 319-337-1113 www.act.org/research/services/freshman/index.html
None.	No cost.	Educational Testing Service Phone: 609-771-7600 E-mail through: www.collegeboard.org/html/communications000.html#SAT Information about data tapes: www.collegeboard.org/sat/html/admissions/serve013.html
Standard overlap with all common acceptances in both surveys; specific overlap analysis includes five competitor schools in ASQ Plus. Both surveys can be customized by specifying characteristics of interest to school. Limited local questions are available.	ASQ $600; ASQ Plus $925. Questionnaire Printing Fee: ASQ $.55 per form; ASQ Plus $.60 per form. Processing Fee: ASQ $2.00 per form returned; ASQ Plus $2.25 per form returned.	Phone: 800-927-4302 E-mail: info@aes.collegeboard.org www.collegeboard.org/aes/asq/html/index000.html
Local additional questions and consortia analyses are available.	For regular paper survey administered by the institution, the cost is $125 plus $.75 per survey and $1.50 scoring fee per completed questionnaire.	College Student Expectations Questionnaire, Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, Indiana University, Ashton Aley Hall Suite 102, 1913 East 7th St., Bloomington, IN 47405-7510. Phone: 812-856-5825. Fax: 812-856-5150. E-mail: cseq@indiana.edu www.indiana.edu/~cseq

TABLE 3 (continued). Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	REPORT INFORMATION	NATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE?
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
College Student Survey (CSS) HERI	The Campus Profile Report includes the results of all respondents. The Follow-up Report contains matched CIRP and CSS results for easy comparison. Special reports and data files available for a fee.	Yes–national aggregates for similar institutions. Complete national aggregates available from HERI.
College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) CPRP	Computer diskette containing raw institutional data file and output file with descriptive statistics. Schools also receive a hard copy of the output file. Additional analyses available for a fee.	No–an annual national report is not planned; however, norms reports are regularly updated and institutional reports include relevant aggregated comparison group data by Carnegie type.
Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) University of Memphis, Center for the Study of Higher Education	Diskette containing all responses and scores for students and a summary computer report are available for a fee of $75.	Yes–national data can be found in the CCSEQ manual, which is available for $12.
Faces of the Future American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and ACT	Participating schools receive national results, an individualized report with information about their student population, a report comparing their data to the national data, and a data file.	Yes.
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) CPRP	Comprehensive institutional profile, aggregated comparison data for similar schools, and national benchmark report. Includes data file, means and frequency distributions on all items, and significance tests. Special analyses available for a fee.	Yes–aggregated comparative information included in standard institutional report and annual national report.

LOCAL ITEMS & CONSORTIA OPTIONS	COST	CONTACT INFORMATION/URL
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Local questions are available. Consortia analyses are available for a fee.	$450 participation fee plus $1 for each survey returned for processing.	Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, 3005 Moore Hall–Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521. Phone: 310-825-1925. Fax: 310-206-2228. E-mail: heri@ucla.edu www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.htm
Local questions are available for a $250 charge. Consortia analyses are available.	For regular paper administration: $125 institutional registration fee plus $.75 per survey ordered and $1.50 scoring fee per completed questionnaire. Web administration cost is $495 institutional registration fee plus $2.25 per completed survey.	College Student Experiences Questionnaire, Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, Indiana University, Ashton Aley Hall Suite 102, 1913 East 7th St., Bloomington, IN 47405-7510. Phone: 812-856-5825. Fax: 812-856-5150. E-mail: cseq@indiana.edu www.indiana.edu/~cseq
Up to 20 local questions are available. CCSEQ can be used in statewide assessment efforts to provide data for strategic planning and staff development.	$.75 per survey purchased and $1.50 per survey for scoring; $75 for print report and data on diskette.	Center for the Study of Higher Education, 308 Browning Hall, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152. Phone: 901-678-2775. Fax: 901-678-4291. E-mail: ccseqlib@memphis.edu www.people.memphis.edu/~coe_cshe/CCSEQ_main.htm
Colleges may add up to 10 local items. Statewide administration is available.	AACC/ACT administration: $.75 per survey (includes scoring) plus $50 processing and reporting fee. Standard administration: $13.65 per 25 surveys plus $.80 each for scanning, $50 processing fee, and $50 reporting fee.	Contact Kent Phillippe, Senior Research Associate, AACC. Phone: 202-728-0200, ext. 222. E-mail: kphillippe@aacc.nche.edu www.aacc.nche.edu/initiatives/faces/f_index.htm
Schools or state systems (i.e., urban, research, selective privates) may form a consortium of at least eight institutions and can ask up to 20 additional consortium-specific questions.	$275 participation fee plus per-student sampling fee based on undergraduate enrollment. Total cost range varies, from approximately $2,500 to $5,500. Targeted over-sampling is available for additional per-student fee.	National Survey of Student Engagement, Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, Indiana University, Ashton Aley Hall Suite 102, 1913 East 7th St., Bloomington, IN 47405-7510. Phone: 812-856-5824. Fax: 812-856-5150. E-mail: nsse@indiana.edu www.indiana.edu/~nsse

TABLE 3 (continued). Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	REPORT INFORMATION	NATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE?
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Your First College Year (YFCY) HERI and Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College	Paper report provides in-depth profile of first-year students by sex, and comparative data for similar institutions. Data file also available.	Yes.
Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) Noel-Levitz	The standard campus report includes the mean data for all students alongside national averages. Optional reports and raw data are available for an additional fee.	Yes–four national comparison groups are standard, are available based on institution type, and are updated twice a year.
Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS) Noel-Levitz	The standard campus report includes the mean data for all students alongside national averages. Optional reports and raw data are available for an additional fee.	Yes–the national comparison group includes data from four-year and two-year institutions and is updated twice a year. As of May 2000, the national group included 4,063 students from 32 institutions.
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) ACT	Institutional summary report and two copies of each student's score report. Certificate of achievement for students scoring at or above national average on one or more modules. Supplemental reports and data file available for a fee.	Yes–for freshmen or sophomores at two- or four-year, public or private institutions.
Academic Profile Educational Testing Service (ETS) and The College Board	Summary score report contains both criterion-referenced proficiency levels and norm-referenced scores. Scores vary slightly from long form to short form. Data diskette included in fee.	Yes–provided by class level and by Carnegie classification.
Tasks in Critical Thinking ETS	Scores are reported as the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in each of the three skill areas–inquiry, analysis, and communication, as measured by the tasks.	No.

LOCAL ITEMS & CONSORTIA OPTIONS	COST	CONTACT INFORMATION/URL
ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATES		
Not available during pilot stages. Local items and consortia options will be available with the full-scale administration beginning in 2002.	No fees during pilot stages.	Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, 3005 Moore Hall–Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521. Phone: 310-825-1925. Fax: 310-206-2228. E-mail: yfcy@ucla.edu www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/yfcy www.brevard.edu/fyc/Survey/YFCYsurvey.htm
Special comparison group reports are available for a fee.	$50 processing and setup fee plus $1.50 to $1.95 per survey, depending on the quantity ordered.	Julie Bryant, Program Consultant: julie-bryant@noellevitz.com or Lisa Logan, Program Consultant: lisa-logan@noellevitz.com. Phone: 800-876-1117 www.noellevitz.com
Special comparison group reports are available for a fee.	$50 processing and setup fee plus $1.50 to $2.95 per survey, depending on the quantity ordered.	Julie Bryant, Program Consultant: julie-bryant@noellevitz.com or Lisa Logan, Program Consultant: lisa-logan@noellevitz.com. Phone: 800-876-1117 www.noellevitz.com
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Nine optional local questions may be added at no additional charge.	$330 participation fee plus $8.95 to $16.55 per student, depending on the number of students and the number of modules purchased (includes instruments, scoring, and reporting).	ACT, Outcomes Assessment, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, IA 52243-0168. Phone: 319-337-1053. Fax: 319-337-1790. E-mail: outcomes@act.org www.act.org/caap/index.html
Up to 50 local questions are available. Institutions can customize comparison groups from list of participating schools (minimum of eight per group).	$300 annual institutional fee. Price varies by form and number purchased ($9 to $11.25 for short form and $14.50 to $16.75 for long form). $2.25 each for optional essay (includes scoring guide). Minimum order of 50 tests.	Jan Lewis at 609-683-2271. Fax: 609-683-2270. E-mail: jlewis@ets.org www.ets.org/hea/acpro/index.html
None.	$16.50 each for first 30 to 100.	Jan Lewis at 609-683-2271. Fax: 609-683-2270. E-mail: jlewis@ets.org www.ets.org/hea/cthink/index.html

TABLE 3 (continued). Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	REPORT INFORMATION	NATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE?
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Major Field Tests ETS	Reports include individual scaled scores, departmental summary with department mean-scaled scores, and demographic information. Special score reports available for an additional fee.	Yes–for each test. Percentile tables for all seniors taking the current form of each test are published each year. Departments may obtain custom comparative data for an additional fee.
Area Concentration Achievement Tests (ACAT) Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing (PACAT) at Austin Peay State University	Schools receive two copies of the score report for each student. Standard scores compare students to five-year national sample. Raw percentage scores of items correct also included. Additional analyses and data file available for a fee.	Yes.
ALUMNI		
Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (CAAS) National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)	Analysis includes one analytical report. Data file available for a fee.	No.
College Results Survey (CRS) Peterson's, a Thomson Learning Company	Institutions receive data file of responses in spreadsheet format for analyses. Analytic tools for institution-based analyses and peer comparisons are being explored.	No. Analytic tools for peer comparisons have been developed and are available to participating institutions at a secure web site.
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS		
Student Outcomes Information Survey (SOIS) NCHEMS	Analysis includes one analytical report. Data file available for a fee.	No.
Evaluation/Survey Services ACT	Basic reporting package includes a summary report, graphics report, and normative report. Other reports and data file available for a fee.	Yes.

LOCAL ITEMS & CONSORTIA OPTIONS	COST	CONTACT INFORMATION/URL
STUDENT PROFICIENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES		
Group scores are reported for up to 50 locally written questions.	$23.50 per test ($23 for 100 or more), plus shipping. Includes Test Administration Manual, standard processing, and national comparative data.	Dina Langrana at 609-683-2272 E-mail: dlangrana@ets.org www.ets.org/hea/mft/index.html
Schools can customize most tests to model the test after major requirements. Art and Literature in English cannot be customized. Social work customization will be available in June 2001.	Price ranges from $4 to $11 per student survey depending on discipline, pre-test vs. senior test, and two-year vs. four-year school. Price includes use of materials, scoring, two copies of the score report, and long-term maintenance of score histories.	PACAT, Box 4568, Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, TN 37044. Phone: 931-221-7451. Fax: 931-221-6127. E-mail: pacat@pacat.apsu.edu http://pacat.apsu.edu/pacat
ALUMNI		
Up to 20 local questions are available for a data entry fee of $1.25 per question.	$.85 per questionnaire plus shipping and handling. $200 for analysis (includes one analytical report).	NCHEMS, P.O. Box 9752, Boulder, CO 80301-9752. Clara Roberts at 303-497-0390. E-mail: clara@nchems.org www.nchems.org/surveys/caas.htm
Collaborative administration among institutions can be explored.	There is no respondent cost to complete the online CRS. Costs for institutional applications of the CRS are being explored as collaborative models are identified.	Rocco P. Russo, VP, Research, Peterson's, a Thomson Learning Company, Princeton Pike Corporate Center, 2000 Lenox Drive, P.O. Box 67005, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648. Phone: 609-896-1800 ext. 3250, toll-free: 800-338-3282 ext. 3250. Fax: 609-896-4535. E-mail: rocco.russo@petersons.com www.petersons.com/collegeresults
SERIES OF INSTRUMENTS		
Up to 15 local questions are available for a data entry fee of $1.25 per question.	$.30 per questionnaire plus shipping and handling. $150 for analysis, which includes one analytical report.	NCHEMS, P.O. Box 9752, Boulder, CO 80301-9752. Clara Roberts at 303-497-0390. E-mail: clara@nchems.org www.nchems.org/surveys/sois.htm
Up to 30 local questions are available. Consortia reports are available for a fee.	$14.35 for 25 four-page surveys. $.84 per survey returned for processing. $168 for basic reporting package (summary report, graphics report, and normative report).	ACT, Postsecondary Services, Outcomes Assessment, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, IA 52243-0168. Phone: 319-337-1053. Fax: 319-337-1790. E-mail: outcomes@act.org www.act.org/ess/index.html

TABLE 3 (continued). Reporting, Data Availability, Local Items, Costs, and Contact Information

INSTRUMENT/ADMINISTRATOR	REPORT INFORMATION	NATIONAL DATA AVAILABLE?
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS		
Faculty Survey HERI	Campus profile report includes faculty responses by gender. Separate profiles of teaching faculty and academic administrators also are provided. Normative profile includes national data by institutional type. Data file is also available.	Yes–in normative profile report.
Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)	Report contains data for total campus, total faculty, and targeted populations.	No.
Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS) Noel-Levitz	The standard campus report includes the mean data for all respondents alongside national averages for like-type institutions. Optional reports (including IPS/SSI reports) and raw data are available for an additional fee.	Yes–three national comparison groups are standard, are available based on institution type, and are updated twice a year.
Program Self-Assessment Service (PSAS) and Graduate Program Self-Assessment Service (GPSA) ETS	Summary data report includes separate analyses for faculty, students, and alumni. Optional subgroup reports and data file available for a fee.	No.

LOCAL ITEMS & CONSORTIA OPTIONS	COST	CONTACT INFORMATION/URL
FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS		
Local questions are available. Consortia analyses are available for a fee.	$325 plus $3.25 per returned survey.	Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, 3005 Moore Hall–Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521. Phone: 310-825-1925. Fax: 310-206-2228. E-mail: heri@ucla.edu www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.htm
Up to 20 local questions are available.	$1,600 for 100 questionnaires. Includes survey, pre-paid return postage, standard analyses, and report summary. After first 100 questionnaires, $150 for each additional 50.	NCHEMS, P.O. Box 9752, Boulder, CO 80301-9752. Clara Roberts at 303-497-0390. E-mail: clara@nchems.org www.nchems.org/surveys/ips.htm
Special comparison group reports are available for a fee.	$140 processing and setup fee plus $1.50 to $2.95 per survey, depending on the quantity ordered.	Julie Bryant, Program Consultant: julie-bryant@noellevitz.com or Lisa Logan, Program Consultant: lisa-logan @noellevitz.com. Phone: 800-876-1117 www.noellevitz.com
Local questions are available.	$37 for 25 questionnaires plus shipping and handling (minimum purchase of 75 questionnaires). $150 for summary data report plus $3.99 per booklet processed.	Karen Krueger at 609-683-2273. Fax: 609-683-2270. E-mail: kkrueger@ets.org PSAS: www.ets.org/hea/psas/index.html GPSA: www.ets.org/hea/gpsa/index.html

BEST COPY AVAILABLE